

REMARKS

Claims 11-13 and 153 have been amended. Claims 1, 4-5, 14-152, 155, 157-163 were previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 2-3, 6-13, 153-154, 156, and 164 are pending in this case.

Claim rejections 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-13, 153, 154, 156 and 164 are 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has noted that “the claims are indefinite in their reliance on canceled claim 4.” Applicants note that only claims 11-13 were still dependent on claim 4 and as such have amended these claims accordingly.

The Examiner has argued that claims 6, 9 and 154 are indefinite in their recitation “wherein (y)_r is not sulfated” and has alleged that (y)_r is shown attached to an “s” in the formula. Applicants respectfully disagree as the S had been surrounded by a double bracket (“[[$(S)_r$]]”) in the amended claims, which denotes that $(S)_r$ was to be deleted. Further, in the last amendment applicants had noted “Formula II and III and accordingly claims 6, 9, 11-13, 156 and 164 have been amended to delete the first two S_r and also to indicate that Y_r are not sulfated, but Y_t is sulfated” to indicate the removal of the first two S_r . The claims (Claims 6 and 9) now reflect the changes that were to be made in the last amendment, and now show this text physically deleted. Applicants respectfully believe that the Examiner included claim 154 with this rejection in error, as claim 154 has no formula.

Claim 153 has been rejected for reciting that at least one amino acid residue is sulfated but yet it depends from a formula where only one residue is sulfated. Applicants have amended claim 153 to correct this discrepancy.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

**Rejection of claims 153 and 154 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)
as being anticipated by Ward et al.**

Claim 153 has been amended as discussed above. Applicants submit that the present claim amendments render this ground of rejection moot. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request entry of the present claim amendments. It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

The Office is authorized to charge any fees that may be necessary for consideration of this paper to Kenyon & Kenyon **Deposit Account No. 11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Date: March 30, 2007

By:

Teresa A. Lavenue
Teresa A. Lavenue
Registration No. 47,737

1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 220-4200
Facsimile: (202) 220-4201
Direct: (202) 220-4258
Customer No.: 26646